



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,723	11/26/2003	Eugene Sindambiwe	6570P007	9776
45962	7590	02/03/2009		
SAP/BSTZ BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			EXAMINER MURDOUGH, JOSHUA A	
			ART UNIT 3621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/03/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/723,723

**Applicant(s)**

SINDAMBIWE, EUGENE

**Examiner**

JOSHUA MURDOUGH

**Art Unit**

3621

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30, 32-39 and 47-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30, 32-39, and 47-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Acknowledgements***

1. This action is responsive to Applicant's amendments filed 17 October 2008.
2. Claims 1-30, 32-39, and 47-50 are pending and have been examined.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-30, 32-39, and 47-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Claim 1 recites, "a second client system to perform data processing of the transmitted portion of the secure electronic record based on semantics of the secure electronic record shared by the second client system and the server system." Under the broadest reasonable interpretation, data processing is considered part of a business transaction. Claim 1 also recites, "a third-party business transaction conducted independent of the server system." For the server system to be independent of the transaction, the server should be able to be removed and the transaction still be processed. However, claim 1 additionally recites, "the server system transmitting at least a portion of the secure electronic record to a second client system." This requires the presence of the server system. Therefore, the claimed method does not allow for the server system to be independent of the transaction. One of ordinary skill in the art would not understand if the server system is or is not part of the business transaction. As Applicant has

documented how the server system is involved in the process, the Examiner has interpreted that this involvement is what was intended to be claimed when applying the prior art.

6. Each of the other independent claims contains similar limitations. Unless otherwise specified, these limitations have been interpreted in a manner consistent with the interpretation of claim 1 when applying the prior art.

7. Claim 47 is directed toward “An article of manufacture comprising: an electronically accessible medium providing instructions that, when executed by an apparatus, cause the apparatus to” perform various tasks. However, one of the tasks includes, “the plurality of client systems to perform data processing of the transmitted portion of the secure electronic record based on semantics of the secure electronic record shared by the plurality of client systems and the apparatus.” This appears to be an attempt to positively recite actions that are not occurring on the apparatus. One of ordinary skill in the art would not understand if this is additional instructions on the client systems or if the instructions executed on the apparatus are somehow controlling the clients. If it was not Applicant’s intent to positively recite the actions on the clients, they are invited to clearly state this on the record. With this statement on the record, this rejection would be withdrawn and the limitation would be interpreted as being functional. Functional limitations are given less patentable weight as outlined in MPEP § 2114.

8. A similar issue also exists in claim 35. The application server has a processor and instructions that are claimed as performing the same task as above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, 14, 15, and 17-23 as understood by the Examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lewis (US 6,233,565).

11. As to claim 1, Lewis shows:

- a. A computer-implemented method comprising:
- b. receiving at a server system **4** a request (labeled as "BATCH" in Figure 1A) from a first client system **6** to generate a secure electronic record of a third-party business transaction conducted independent of the server system between a buyer and the first client system (Figure 1, Buyer **2n** and Seller/first client **6** are separate from the server **4**), wherein the received request includes data associated with the third-party business transaction (database data of the transactions, Column 19, lines 27-32);
- c. in response to the received request (request contains data needed, therefore the actions can only be performed after the data is received),
- d. generating with a security service **40** of the server system the secure electronic record of the third-party transaction (log as shown in step **206** & "evidence of payment" in Column 2, lines 9-14), and

- e. the server system transmitting at least a portion of the secure electronic record to a second client system (in the form of a receipt, Abstract) to perform data processing (printing, Abstract) of the transmitted portion of the secure electronic record based on semantics (data is uniquely identifying, Abstract) of the secure electronic record shared by the second client system and the server system (receipt).
- 12. As to claim 3, Lewis further shows:  
authenticating the received data associated with the third-party business transaction (Column 5, lines 11-26).
- 13. As to claim 4, Lewis further shows:  
generating a digital signature for the secure electronic record (Column 5, lines 30-32).
- 14. As to claim 5, Lewis further shows:  
encrypting at least a portion of the secure electronic record (encrypted e-mail, Column 11, lines 38-45).
- 15. As to claim 6, Lewis further shows:  
providing an identifier (license number) for the secure electronic record to uniquely identify the secure electronic record (Column 11, lines 35-37).

16. As to claim 7, Lewis further shows:  
  
generating a secure electronic receipt of the third-party business transaction (“The receipt includes the client digital signature,” Abstract)
17. As to claim 10, Lewis further shows:  
  
a digital signature corresponding to the data associated with the third-party business transaction (“The receipt includes the client digital signature,” Abstract).
18. As to claim 11, Lewis further shows:  
  
the secure electronic record is a secure electronic receipt (The receipt containing a digital signature is generated and transmitted and can be printed by the client. Clearly the receipt is electronic.; Abstract).
19. As to claim 12, Lewis further shows:  
  
receiving the data according to the HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP) (This is the standard when accessing a website with a browser such as the one described in column 2, lines 42-47)
20. As to claim 14, Lewis further shows:  
  
transmitting at least a portion of the secure electronic record to a special organization (postal authority such as Royal Mail, UPS, Federal Express, or USPS; Column 2,

lines 56-62).

21. As to claim 15, Lewis further shows:  
  
the special organization is a tax collecting organization ("tax stamp issuing authorities for state, federal and other government agencies;" Column 38, lines 26-58).
22. As to claim 17, Lewis further shows:  
  
the received request defines a portion of the secure electronic record that is transmitted to the client (the receipt contains some portion of the transaction data transmitted in the request. Abstract).
23. As to claim 18, Lewis further shows:  
  
encrypting, at least a portion of, the generated secure electronic record of the third- party business transaction (Column 15, lines 61-64).
24. As to claim 19, Lewis further shows:  
  
obtaining a digital signature corresponding to the received data associated with the third-party business transaction (Column 15, lines 47-64).
25. As to claim 20, Lewis further shows:



authenticating the received data associated with the third-party business transaction (via digital signature, Id.).

26. As to claim 21, Lewis further shows:

the second client system is a special authority system (By registering and installing software on the client, it becomes operable with the special authority. Columns 15-16, lines 6-4).

27. As to claim 22, Lewis further shows:

the special authority client system is a tax collecting authority system ("tax stamp issuing authorities for state, federal and other government agencies;" Column 38, lines 26-58).

28. As to claim 23, Lewis further shows:

maintaining a copy of the transmitted portion of the secure electronic record to validate the transfer of the secure electronic record (stored on log server 195, described in column 35, lines 51-62).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

29. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

30. Claims 2, 8, 13, 16, 24-28, 30, 32, 34-39, and 47-50, as understood by the Examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of MPEP 2144.04 V (C.).

31. As to claims 2, 8, 13, and 16, Lewis disclosed as discussed above in regards to claim 1.

32. Lewis does not expressly show the division of the tasks between multiple client systems as set out in claims 2, 8, 13, and 16.

33. However, MPEP 2144.04 V (C.) states that it is obvious to make components separable “if it were considered desirable for any reason.” In the instant case, it would be desirable to have multiple clients receiving at least part of the transaction record to enable corporate billing procedures where both the individual and the accounting office need a receipt. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Lewis to have multiple clients as described above, in order to take the burden off the individual for providing the receipt to the accounting office.

34. As to claim 24, Lewis shows:

A system comprising:

a secure electronic record server system **4** to generate with a security service **40** a secure electronic record (log as shown in step **206** & “evidence of payment” in Column 2, lines 9-14) of a third-party business transaction conducted between a buyer and the first client system independent of the secure electronic record server system (Figure 1, Buyer **2n** and Seller/first client **6** are separate from the server **4**), the

generating responsive to receiving a request from the first client system (request contains data needed, therefore the actions can only be performed after the data is received), the request including data associated with a third-party 6 transaction (database data of the transactions, Column 19, lines 27-32), and the secure electronic record server system further to transmit to a second client system at least a portion of the secure electronic record (in the form of a receipt, Abstract) to perform data processing (printing, Abstract) of the transmitted portion of the secure electronic record based on semantics (data is uniquely identifying, Abstract) of the secure electronic record shared by the second client system and the server system (receipt),

35. Lewis does not expressly show:

a plurality of client systems other than the first client system coupled with the secure electronic record server system.

36. However, MPEP 2144.04 V (C.) states that it is obvious to make components separable “if it were considered desirable for any reason.” In the instant case, it would be desirable to have multiple clients receiving at least part of the transaction record to enable corporate billing procedures where both the individual and the accounting office need a receipt. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Lewis to have multiple clients as described above, in order to take the burden off the individual for providing the receipt to the accounting office.

37. As to claim 25, Lewis further shows:

the plurality of client systems includes a tax collecting ("tax stamp issuing authorities for state, federal and other government agencies;" Column 38, lines 26-58) authority system (By registering and installing software on the client, it becomes operable with the special authority. Columns 15-16, lines 6-4).

38. As to claim 26, Lewis further shows:

the secure electronic record is a secure electronic receipt (The receipt containing a digital signature is generated and transmitted and can be printed by the client. Clearly the receipt is electronic.; Abstract).

39. As to claim 27, Lewis further shows:

the secure electronic record server system is coupled with the plurality of client systems through the Internet **30**.

40. As to claim 28, Lewis further shows:

an authentication mechanism **315** to authenticate the received data associated with the third-party business transaction.

41. As to claim 30, Lewis further shows:

an encryption mechanism to encrypt at least a portion of the secure electronic record (encrypted e-mail, Column 11, lines 38-45).

42. As to claim 32, Lewis further shows:

a digital signature mechanism to verify that the received data associated with the third-party business transaction has not been altered (Column 5, lines 30-32).

43. As to claim 34, Lewis further shows:

an identifier generator to provide a unique identifier for the secure electronic record (indiciu 74, as described in Column 18, lines 10-32).

44. As to claim 35, Lewis shows:

- f. An application server **4** comprising:
- g. a network interface **112** to connect to a first client system **6**;
- h. a processor and electronically accessible medium (both inherent on any hardware web server such as **150**) providing instructions that, when executed by the processor, cause the processor to
- i. receive from the first client system **6** a request (labeled as "BATCH" in Figure 1A) to generate a secure electronic record of a third-party business transaction conducted independent of the application server (Figure 1, Buyer **2n** and Seller/first client **6** are separate from the server **4**), wherein the received request includes data associated with the third-party business transaction (database data of the transactions, Column 19, lines 27-32);,
- j. generate with a security service **40** a secure electronic record of the third-party business transaction (log as shown in step **206**), and

- k. transmit at least a portion of the secure electronic record to a second client (in the form of a receipt, Abstract) other than the first client system, the second client system ; and a network interface 112 to connect to at least one of the plurality of clients (in the form of a receipt, Abstract) to perform data processing (printing, Abstract) of the transmitted portion of the secure electronic record based on semantics (data is uniquely identifying, Abstract) of the secure electronic record shared by the second client system and the application server (receipt).
45. Lewis does not expressly show a plurality of clients.
46. However, MPEP 2144.04 V (C.) states that it is obvious to make components separable “if it were considered desirable for any reason.” In the instant case, it would be desirable to have multiple clients receiving at least part of the transaction record to enable corporate billing procedures where both the individual and the accounting office need a receipt. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Lewis to have multiple clients as described above, in order to take the burden off the individual for providing the receipt to the accounting office.
47. As to claim 36, Lewis further shows:  
authenticate the received data associated with the third-party business transaction  
(Column 5, lines 11-26).
48. As to claim 37, Lewis further shows:  
reference a digital signature associated with the received data to determine whether the  
received data has been altered (Column 5, lines 30-32).

49. As to claim 38, Lewis further shows:  
encrypting at least a portion of the secure electronic record (encrypted e-mail, Column 11, lines 38-45).
50. As to claim 39, Lewis further shows:  
an identifier generator to provide a unique identifier for the secure electronic record (encrypted e-mail, Column 11, lines 38-45).
51. As to claim 47, Lewis shows:
- l. An article of manufacture comprising:
  - m. an electronically accessible medium providing instructions that, when executed by an apparatus, cause the apparatus to
  - n. receive a request (labeled as "BATCH" in Figure 1A) from a first client system **6** to generate a secure electronic record of a third-party business transaction conducted independent of the apparatus (Figure 1, Buyer **2n** and Seller/first client **6** are separate from the apparatus **4**),
  - o. wherein the received request includes data associated with the third-party business transaction (database data of the transactions, Column 19, lines 27-32);
  - p. generate with a security service **40** the secure electronic record of the third-party business transaction (log as shown in step **206**); and

transmit at least a portion of the secure electronic record to a client (in the form of a receipt, Abstract) to perform data processing (printing, Abstract) of the transmitted portion of the secure electronic record based on semantics (data is uniquely identifying, Abstract) of the secure electronic record shared by the second client system and the server system (receipt),

52. Lewis does not expressly show a plurality of clients.

53. However, MPEP 2144.04 V (C.) states that it is obvious to make components separable “if it were considered desirable for any reason.” In the instant case, it would be desirable to have multiple clients receiving at least part of the transaction record to enable corporate billing procedures where both the individual and the accounting office need a receipt. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Lewis to have multiple clients as described above, in order to take the burden off the individual for providing the receipt to the accounting office.

54. As to claim 48, Lewis further shows:

encrypting at least a portion of the secure electronic record (encrypted e-mail, Column 11, lines 38-45).

55. As to claim 49, Lewis further shows:

obtaining an electronic signature corresponding to the received data associated with the third-party business transaction (Column 5, lines 30-32).



56. As to claim 50, Lewis further shows:

authenticating the received data associated with the third-party business transaction (Id.).

57. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of RFC 2617.

58. Lewis teaches as disclosed above, but does not expressly teach:

an authentication token corresponding to the data associated with the third-party business transaction.

59. However, Applicant admits that the token is disclosed in RFC 2617 (Specification, paragraph [0041]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Lewis to implement authentication via a token in compliance with RFC 2617 because compliance with a standard allows greater interoperability.

60. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis and the MPEP 2144.04 V (C.) as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of RFC 2617.

61. Lewis and the MPEP 2144.04 V (C.) teach as disclosed above, but do not expressly teach:

the authentication mechanism implements, at least in part, Request For Comments 2617 to authenticate the received data associated with the third-party business transaction.

62. However, authentication according to RFC 2617 is clearly disclosed in RFC 2617.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Lewis to implement authentication compliance with RFC 2617 because compliance with a standard allows greater interoperability.

63. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis and the MPEP 2144.04 V(C.) as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of RFC 3275.

64. Lewis and the MPEP 2144.04 V (C.) teach as disclosed above, but do not expressly teach:

the digital signature mechanism implements, at least in part, Request For Comments 3275  
to verify that the received data associated with the third-party business transaction  
has not been altered.

65. However, verification according to RFC 2617 is clearly disclosed in RFC 2617.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Lewis to implement verification compliance with RFC 2617 because compliance with a standard allows greater interoperability.

### ***Claim Interpretations***

66. The Examiner maintains his interpretation of functional limitations in apparatus claims as set out in paragraph 87 of the previous action.

67. Applicant is reminded that optional or conditional elements (*e.g.* claim 1 which recites "to perform data processing of the transmitted portion of the secure electronic record based on

semantics of the secure electronic record shared by the second client system and the server system") do not narrow the claims because they can always be omitted. See *e.g.* MPEP §2106 II C.: "Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. [Emphasis in original.]" In this case, the word "to" suggests an intent to perform the action but does not require the action to be performed.

### ***Definitions***

68. The Examiner hereby adopts the following definitions under the broadest reasonable interpretation standard. In accordance with *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1056, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1029 (Fed. Cir. 1997), the Examiner points to these other sources to support his interpretation of the claims.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, these definitions are only a guide to claim terminology since claim terms must be interpreted in context of the surrounding claim language. Finally, the following list is not intended to be exhaustive in any way:

***Associate***: "4 : to bring together or into relationship in any of various intangible ways (as in memory or imagination)." Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, Merriam-Webster Inc., Springfield MA, 1986.

***Independent***: "1b (1) : not requiring or relying on something else: not contingent." Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, Merriam-Webster Inc., Springfield MA, 1986.

---

<sup>1</sup> While most definition(s) are cited because these terms are found in the claims, the Examiner may have provided additional definition(s) to help interpret words, phrases, or concepts found in the definitions themselves or in the prior art.

**To:** “2a -- used as a function word to indicate purpose, intention, tendency, result, or end.” Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, Merriam-Webster Inc., Springfield MA, 1986. The Examiner provided additional definitions in the previous action (Paragraph 89). The Examiner maintains those definitions in support of the broadest reasonable interpretation as well.

***Response to Arguments***

69. Applicant's arguments filed 17 October 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

70. Applicant has primarily argued their claims as amended against the prior art as previously cited. Applicant's amendments have resulted in a different interpretation by the Examiner. The Examiner has modified his citations to better fit Applicant's amended claims.

71. Additionally, some of Applicant's amendments have resulted in rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. Accordingly, arguments patentability due to these limitations are not persuasive.

72. Applicants argue:

73. “With regard to the relied-upon BATCH exchange of FIG. 1 A of Lewis, Applicants note that the BATCH exchange relates only to the offloading of indicia files to a third party seller (TPS)” (Remarks, Page 17, Paragraph 1).

74. Examiner's response:

75. The actual indicia are not what is batched. An indicium is what is printed on an envelope. The data about the indicia transactions is stored in a database (Column 19, lines 27-32). It is this database data that is sent in batches (Id.). Therefore, the sent data is an electronic record of the business transaction.

***Conclusion***

76. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a).

77. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

78. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSHUA MURDOUGH whose telephone number is (571)270-3270. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on (571) 272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

79. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joshua Murdough  
Examiner, Art Unit 3621

/ANDREW J. FISCHER/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3621